UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,349	03/26/2004	Jerome Asius	22114-00001-US1	7560
	7590 12/18/200 BOVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
1875 EYE STR SUITE 1100	EET, N.W.	PREBILIC, PAUL B		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20036	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3774	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	Advisory Action	10/809,349	ASIUS ET AL.	•
450	Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Paul B. Prebilic	3774	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE	REPLY FILED 07 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. 🛚	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff dice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a)	\square The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	ion.
	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).	•	
nave under set fo may r	nsions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exert 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sorth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) ICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed NDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since
		hut miss to the date of filling a brief	will mak be entered by	
3. ∟_	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co			ecause
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		1 L DOIOW),	
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE:		ected claims.	
			maliant Amandmant	(DTOL 224)
	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		impliant Amendment	(FTOL-324).
5			timely filed amondme	nt concoling the
6	non-allowable claim(s).	nowable il submitted ill a separate,	umery med amendine	in canceing the
7. 🗌	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	vided below of appended.		
	Claim(s) allowed:			
	Claim(s) objected to:			
	Claim(s) rejected:			
۸۳۲۰	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: IDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
] The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	it before or on the date of filing a N	otice of Anneal will no	nt he entered
o	because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and
۵ 🗆	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing	a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the	date of filing a brief.	will not be

entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other: ____.

Paul B. Prebilic **Primary Examiner** Art Unit: 3774

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it is unpersuasive. Applicant argues that Sander is not a gel based upon file wrapper estoppel in a parent application. However, this application is distinct from the parent application and the file wrapper estoppel thereof has not been incorporated into the present application. Furthermore, in the present application, the Applicant argues that gels merely "can" be defined the same way that they were defined in the parent application; see the third paragraph on page 2 of the response. It is clear from this statement that the Applicant does not consider the term "gel" as necessarily limited to the extent that it was in the parent application. Additionally, most of the present claims do not utilize the term "gel" but rather utilize the term "hydrogel precursor". Moreover, the claims have a much broader scope than that of the claims of the patented parent application. Additionally, Sander discloses a "gel" as one form of this device so the argument that Sander does not disclose a "gel" is misplaced; see column 2, lines 35-56. The Applicant also argues that the Sander material is not "reconstitutable" as claimed. However, upon reviewing column 1, line 56 to column 2, line 32, it is clear to the Examiner that a reconstitution process is being described in that the material is wetted to form a workable material. The Applicant also argues that "the material of Sander after being implanted is to be shaped such as with a spatual and once it is dried it will harden." However, Sander states the contrary in the passage from column 1, line 56 to column 2, line 32 where he says that it "will not set into a rock hard material like plaster of paris which, when wetted, begins to set and lose workability within five to ten minutes. Therefore, the composition of the present invention retains workability or moldability characteristics for an extended period of time after being wetted, resulting in improved overall handling characteristics for an extended period of time after being wetted." It is not clear how the material will be dried when it within the body surrounded by bodily fluids. For these reasons and more, the rejections have been maintained.